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**DISCLAIMER**

The author does not accept any liability with regard to the use that may be made of the information contained in this document. Usage of the information remains under the sole responsibility of the user. Statements made or information contained in the document are without prejudice to any further regulatory work that ECHA or the Member States may initiate at a later stage. Risk Management Option Analyses and their conclusions are compiled on the basis of available information and may change in light of newly available information or further assessment.

# Foreword

The purpose of Risk Management Option analysis (RMOA) is to help authorities decide whether further regulatory risk management activities are required for a substance and to identify the most appropriate instrument to address a concern.

RMOA is a voluntary step, i.e., it is not part of the processes as defined in the legislation. For authorities, documenting the RMOA allows the sharing of information and promoting early discussion, which helps lead to a common understanding on the action pursued. A Member State or ECHA (at the request of the Commission) can carry out this case-by-case analysis in order to conclude whether a substance is a 'relevant substance of very high concern (SVHC)' in the sense of the SVHC Roadmap to 2020[[1]](#footnote-1).

An RMOA can conclude that regulatory risk management at EU level is required for a substance (e.g. harmonised classification and labelling, Candidate List inclusion, restriction, other EU legislation) or that no regulatory action is required at EU level. Any subsequent regulatory processes under the REACH Regulation include consultation of interested parties and appropriate decision making involving Member State Competent Authorities and the European Commission as defined in REACH.

This Conclusion document provides the outcome of the RMOA carried out by the author authority. In this conclusion document, the authority considers how the available information collected on the substance can be used to conclude whether regulatory risk management activities are required for a substance and which is the most appropriate instrument to address a concern. With this Conclusion document the Commission, the competent authorities of the other Member States and stakeholders are informed of the considerations of the author authority. In case the author authority proposes in this conclusion document further regulatory risk management measures, this shall not be considered initiating those other measures or processes. Since this document only reflects the views of the author authority, it does not preclude Member States or the European Commission from considering or initiating regulatory risk management measures which they deem appropriate.

### OVERVIEW OF OTHER PROCESSES / EU LEGISLATION

### CONCLUSION OF RMOA

This conclusion is based on the REACH and CLP data as well as other available relevant information taking into account the SVHC Roadmap to 2020, where appropriate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Conclusions** | **Tick box** |
| Need for follow-up regulatory action at EU level: |  |
| *Harmonised classification and labelling* |  |
| *Identification as SVHC (authorisation)* |  |
| *Restriction under REACH* |  |
| *Other EU-wide regulatory measures* | x |
| Need for action other than EU regulatory action |  |
| No action needed at this time |  |

### Need for follow-up regulatory action at EU level

### Other EU-wide regulatory measures (Dossier/Substance Evaluation)

N-(methoxymethyl)acrylamide (NMMA) is a structurally similar analogue to acrylamide. We consider that the current data for NMMA provided by the registrant does not allow to conclude on the mutagenic potential of this substance. The information requirements at this tonnage level (1-10 tpa) are not fulfilled. An in vitro gene mutation study in bacteria may be requested. However, based on the known mode of action of acrylamide (and analogues), the outcome of the bacteria test would most likely not clarify the mutagenicity concern in this case. A better test to clarify this concern would be an in vitro/in vivo micronucleus test, to be requested through substance evaluation.

We conclude that the most appropriate first step would be compliance check to clarify the mutagenic potential of the substance, preferrable to check the registrant’s read across argumentation. If, after compliance check of the read across argumentation, there is still uncertainty about this endpoint, a substance evaluation may be the next regulatory risk management action, instead of requesting a mutation study in bacteria via CCH.

### TENTATIVE PLAN FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS IF NECESSARY

Indication of a tentative plan is not a formal commitment by the authority. A commitment to prepare a REACH Annex XV dossier (SVHC, restrictions) and/or CLP Annex VI dossier should be made via the Registry of Intentions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Follow-up action** | **Date for follow-up** | **Actor** |
| Dossier Evaluation/Substance Evaluation |  |  |

1. For more information on the SVHC Roadmap: <http://echa.europa.eu/addressing-chemicals-of-concern/substances-of-potential-concern/svhc-roadmap-to-2020-implementation> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)